



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,648	04/04/2001	Joseph Wytman	003481.P009D	9902

8791 7590 11/17/2003

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

MUTSCHLER, BRIAN L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1753

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/825,648

Applicant(s)

WYTMAN, JOSEPH

Examiner

Brian L. Mutschler

Art Unit

1753

All Participants:

(1) Brian L. Mutschler.

(2) Larry Johnson.

Status of Application: After Final Rejection Mailed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 November 2003

Time: 1:30pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

all

Claims discussed:

all pending

Prior art documents discussed:

Getchel (U.S. Pat. No. 6,019,164)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Brian L. Mutschler 11/13/2003
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Johnson raised a question about the Getchel reference and its use in the rejection of the claims. Specifically, the use of the chuck in Getchel as a "non-tilting" chuck in one embodiment (see col. 6, line 38+) was discussed in regard to the "tilting" limitation in claim 17. While Getchel does suggest that at least one embodiment is non-tilting, it appears that the embodiment shown in Figure 5 and described beginning in column 12 at line 36 is capable of tilting by the use of springs (206) holding the upper and lower supports together. However, it was suggested that changing the "tilting" limitation in claim 17 to positively recite a step of "preventing or reducing leakage of the processing fluid by tilting the wafer to compliantly engage the wafer and the sleeve" would distinguish the instant claim over the teachings of Getchel. The chuck in Getchel is designed to compensate for thermal expansion, and Getchel does not disclose tilting the chuck to prevent leakage or to compliantly engage the wafer to the sleeve. The interview clarified the positions regarding the claims with respect to the Getchel reference, but no agreement was reached..